

**Understanding New Zealand's  
Antarctic Tourism Policy**

**The Apparently Revised New Zealand Policy Statement on Tourism  
and Other Non Governmental Activities in Antarctica**

**History, Strategy, Challenges**

**8 January 2005**

## **Introduction**

In 2003, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade released the New Zealand Policy Statement on Tourism and Other Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica. (Appendix 1). Commentary by Helen Clark states that this occurred in response to a review of New Zealand's interests, and that the new policy reflects not only enduring interests, but accounts for emerging priorities both nationally and internationally (Clark, cited Conte, 2004, p220).

The Director of Heritage Expeditions, the only New Zealand owned and operated tourism business to Antarctica, suggested that the policy will significantly alter the goalposts for New Zealand tourism operators in the Antarctic, and will have a negative impact on New Zealand tourism in the long term (Russ, 2004).

Public policy analysis focuses on what governments do and why they do it. It is an important tool in trying to unravel why policies are adopted, how they work, and to evaluate their merit or worth (Buhrs & Bartlett, p3, 1993).

This review will cursorily trace the development of New Zealand's strategic objectives in Antarctica over the past 20 years, with a particular focus on Antarctic tourism. It will seek to understand the drivers behind the development of New Zealand's policy on tourism in Antarctica.

A previous Graduate Certificate in Antarctic Studies literature review pointed to the paradox between the "tension in the values of stakeholders, often economic, and that of environmental stewardship, which marks the discourse on the future of New Zealand Antarctic Tourism management" (Wouters, year unknown, p1).

This investigation raises an even more significant issue – it uncovers the risk that Antarctic tourism may present to the Antarctic Treaty System and consequently, to regional stability. This threat to New Zealand security appears to have been the key driver in the development of the New Zealand Policy Statement on Antarctic Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica.

## **Discussion**

### **1 The New Zealand Policy Environment**

#### **1.1 New Zealand and the Global Environment**

New Zealand is a small island nation, making up only 0.06% of the global population (Clark and Williams, 1995, p21). The analogy that “we are globally a small fish in a large pond” aptly describes New Zealand’s position, and the need to tread with care regarding foreign policy matters. McKinnon reports that the drivers of New Zealand foreign policy are trade and security considerations, however, he believes that environmental issues are now taking on greater significance and will continue to do so (McKinnon, cited Trotter, 1993, p7). These views are fairly representative of authors consulted on New Zealand in the global marketplace (Clark & Williams, 1995., Yeabsley, 2001).

#### **1.2 New Zealand and Antarctica**

New Zealand is situated on the back door of Antarctica, and as such, Antarctica has implications for New Zealand in terms of regional security and regional environmental wellbeing. This relationship has been documented by many authors (Burton., Galvin, 1987., Prior, 1997). It is no secret that New Zealand has had a long history of involvement in polar exploration, exercises jurisdiction in the Ross Dependency, and was one of the original signatories to the Antarctic Treaty.

There is abundant literature on the role of New Zealand in the Antarctic Treaty System. New Zealand has been and continues to be an influential and forward thinking Treaty member. This is evidenced by the range of working papers submitted to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings, Meetings of Experts and the wide range of initiatives raised by New Zealand throughout the Antarctic Treaty System management processes.

The level of New Zealand's involvement in Antarctica has not been consistent, however. This has been reported in a series of reviews and reports, and culminated in the separation of policy and operational functions in the 1990's. A detailed analysis of this decision is beyond the scope of this report.

### 1.3 New Zealand's Antarctic and Tourism Policy Making Machines

The institutions responsible for Antarctica policy in New Zealand include the Antarctic Policy Unit and Officials Antarctic Committee and New Zealand Antarctic Institute, operating under the New Zealand Antarctic Institute Act. The Antarctic Policy Unit describes its responsibility as "supporting and pursuing the Government's objectives in respect to Antarctica (MFAT Website, 2004).

In terms of developing New Zealand tourism policy, the Tourism Policy Group within the Ministry of Commerce used to hold this responsibility, however it was replaced by the Office of Tourism and Sport on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2004. Regardless of the name of the institution responsible for New Zealand tourism policy, a review of the Tourism Strategy 2010 and associated documents shows no mention of Antarctica, IAATO (International Association of Antarctic Tour Operators) or Antarctic tourism.

Throughout this time, the Antarctic Policy Unit within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade continued to be responsible for Antarctic related policies, and therefore the policy relating to Antarctic tourism. The author's queries to the Tourism Association of New Zealand and Ministry of Tourism regarding Antarctic tourism were re-directed immediately to the Antarctic Policy Unit.

This investigation sought but did not identify linkages between the Antarctic Policy Unit and the newly revived Office of Tourism and Sport in the area of Antarctic tourism policy development, nor was evidence located of Ministry of Tourism representation on the Officials Antarctic Committee (OAC). The Antarctic Policy Unit website states that the Minister of Tourism is not a member of the OAC, however, "domestic stakeholders are consulted if required" (MFAT website, 2004). A level of communication between agencies exists, however, as the Office of Tourism and Sport was aware of the Antarctic tourism policy (Miller, 2005). The

“Tourism Policy Group” also appears to have had an interest in Antarctic Tourism at some point, as some references and statements from this group relating to Antarctica tourism were located. Unfortunately a direct link to their old website was not found, and past documents and reports were untraceable.

#### 1.4 The Role of Tourism in the New Zealand Economy

A significant volume of literature exists on the role that tourism plays in the New Zealand economy. New Zealand is seen as a clean green country and this image is carefully cultivated by New Zealand tourism organizations. The Tourism Industry Association of New Zealand (TIANZ) publishes “general policy principles” which uses words such as “reducing government intervention” and “economic growth” (TIANZ website, 2004).

#### 1.5 Antarctic Tourism and New Zealand

Tourists first visited the Antarctic Peninsular area in 1958, and the Ross Sea in 1966. Robertson states that the reason that the development of tourism was slow was that strict rules were laid down by the Antarctic Treaty and individual governments regarding the conduct of tourists in the area (Robertson, cited Galvin, 1987, p39). This seems to overlook the environmental, logistical and societal elements which would have contributed to lack of expansion. Robertson goes on to state that New Zealand has done well in respect to controlling Antarctic tourism, as it was the first country to introduce a policy on the matter. This document supports the view that such a policy (New Zealand Policy on Antarctic Tourism) was developed prior to 1987, and this was the earliest reference found to a policy. Further evidence of its existence and a printed version, could not be found.

In 1987 Thompson summarised current thinking when he stated that “given the enormous costs that any commercial entrepreneur would face, Antarctica will remain with science and scientists” (Thompson, cited Galvin, 1987, p39). This is clearly not true in today's world.

In recent years tourism in the Antarctic region has diversified and expanded in unforeseen ways. In the last ten years visitor numbers have risen from 5000 to more than 15,000, and projections suggest the number could increase by a further 10,000 over the next five years. (Waterhouse et al, p3.24, 2001). Currently around 500-1000 tourists depart each year from New Zealand to visit the Ross Sea region.

## **2 Antarctic Related Strategy and Policy**

### **2.1 An Overview of New Zealand's Strategic Involvement in Antarctica**

Overwhelmingly, commentators reiterate and reinforce that the key factor underpinning all New Zealand policy and interest in Antarctica is a strong concern for the security and stability of the region (McKinnon, 1996., Prior 1997).

Authors also report a determination to ensure that the environment of the Ross Dependency and of the Antarctic continent as a whole, is protected. This sentiment however, is generally preceded and followed by a reiteration of the commitment to the fundamental Treaty principle that "Antarctica shall continue for ever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes". (Antarctic Treaty, 1959). New Zealand works towards achieving this aim by minimizing threats to the Antarctic Treaty System and placing this consideration before all others. This is the backstop position for all New Zealand Antarctic related policy.

The history of New Zealand's strategic interest in Antarctica has been summarised in several key documents, most of which were published in the 1980's. Several authors have commented on the difficulty in obtaining published resources on New Zealand Antarctic policy and political debate (Alley, cited Galvin, p6 1987., Wouters, date unknown). This finding was supported during this investigation, however, the reasons for the scarcity of information are likely to have altered from those suggested by Alley in the 1980's.

A review of the literature on the history of New Zealand strategic interest in Antarctica reveals three key “active” phases where there appears to be heightened penmanship and publication.

#### Pre 1980's

Throughout the 1970's, New Zealand's strategic focus remained primarily on security. In 1975 New Zealand first expressed concern about the potential for discord amongst treaty signatories should lucrative mining and resource rights issues eventuate, and tentatively suggested a mining moratorium and the World Park concept. New Zealand offered to relinquish its claim to the Ross Dependency in return for such as agreement. (Wallace, cited Galvin, p16, 1987). This suggestion was firmly embedded in New Zealand's security concerns.

Domestic statements regarding the purpose of the minerals convention were in conflict, with Beeby seeing the interest as political, and the then Minister of Energy (Bill Birch – Government website) seeing the economic potential for the country (Wallace, 1987).

#### 1984 – 1989

In 1984 the fourth Labour Government reviewed the New Zealand policy on Antarctica, and from this point forward there began to be increased importance attributed to environmental protection. Little attention appears to have been given to Antarctic tourism as it was considered unlikely and uneconomical - commercial mineral development was still considered the primary risk.

The New Zealand Government's position was to proceed from an assumption that protection of the environment could best be accomplished if commercial interest in the region was minimised. In effect this meant that the number of permitted uses on Antarctica needed to be tightly controlled (Galvin, 1987, p45). Similarities can be drawn between New Zealand's proactive restrictive position regarding mining in the 1980's and its proactive restrictive position relating to Antarctic tourism in 2004.

New Zealand first promoted a comprehensive protection regime which included rules to regulate the impact of tourism at the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting in Paris 1989 (Beeby, 1989). The Environmental Protocol was initially considered to be an appropriate mechanism to manage Antarctic tourism, however following the implementation of the Environmental Protocol it was later determined that this would not be an adequate mechanism for control.

The key overriding New Zealand strategic themes continued, however, albeit in a different context. Namely, that nothing should be done to prejudice or damage the New Zealand claim to sovereignty over the Ross Dependency (this was now of increased importance) and that the region remained demilitarized and under stable governance.

1994 – 1997

In 1994 the New Zealand Government conducted a review of the nation's strategic objectives in Antarctica and seriously began considering how the effects of non-scientific activities in Antarctica (eco-tourism, recreational-tourism, educational uses) could be effectively managed and controlled. This is the first identified point in the literature where Antarctic tourism and non-governmental activities were first really considered (Prior, 1997, p3).

Following this review the 1995 Statement of Strategic Interest in Antarctica was developed. This document reconfirmed that New Zealand policy in Antarctica was grounded in a sovereign interest which was defined as :

“...the conservation of the intrinsic values of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean for the benefit of the whole community, and for present and future generations of New Zealanders.

Active and responsible stewardship should promote NZ interest by :



- Maintaining NZ long term interest in, and commitment to the Ross Dependency
- Keeping Antarctica as a neutral and non-aligned neighbour
- Enhancing NZ economic opportunities in Antarctica within the parameters of the Antarctic Treaty System
- Enhancing NZ leadership in the governance of Antarctica
- Promoting Antarctica as a natural reserve devoted to peace and science"

(Prior 1995)

These broad principles neatly encapsulate New Zealand's interests at the time.

The concept of active and responsible stewardship now became a key strategic goal for the NZ government. The notion of the Antarctic as a "stewarded" place does not appear to resolve or mitigate any of the tension that exists between environmental protection and resource exploitation, and "conservation" has been used instead of a more robust and restrictive term, such as "protection". This wording implies that some degree of resource utilisation should be permitted.

This increased internal and external awareness of the potential for resource exploitation (mineral, tourism, fisheries) came at a time when New Zealand was becoming increasingly aware of global economics. Commentators report throughout the literature from the early 1990's that the New Zealand economy was "failing to deliver" (Clark & Williams, 1995, p21) and the messages of this time were that economic reform and expansion were important.

Science and scientific activity were no longer sole defining indicators of New Zealand Antarctic activities, as enhancing economic opportunities had become a strategic objective. Tourism and other revenue generation opportunities were now given legitimacy. This was a significant change within the New Zealand position.

Some authors state that New Zealand has adopted a precautionary approach to protecting the fragile Antarctic environment (Goff, 2003), however, the above strategic statement clearly places commercial interests ahead of Antarctica as "a

natural reserve devoted to peace and science". It is this author's opinion that the New Zealand Government took a permissive approach and that this signals its intention to promote resource utilisation within Treaty "restrictions" rather than restricting resource use and/or exploitation.

A more detailed analysis of the Government policy statements is beyond the scope of this report.

## 2.2 The 2003 Statement of Strategic Interest in Antarctica

In May 2002 the Government adopted a new Statement of Strategic Interest in Antarctica, replacing the 1995 statement. There is a gap in the published literature between 1989 and the appearance of the revised strategy statement.

The key issues contained in the 1995 strategy statement are reflected in the new strategy statement. However, the updated statement also reflects issues which have arisen since 1995, including the adoption of the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy, international sustainable management objectives, the expansion of tourism and public access to the continent and the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (Hughes, cited Conte, p219).

The new statement expressly states that national peace and security are of utmost importance regarding the governance of Antarctica. It emphasizes New Zealand's interest in conservation and managing marine living organisms.

The new statement also uses the phrase "sustainable economic benefits" to reduce to previously stated importance of "enhancing economic opportunities" in Antarctica. This is a significant signal, and appears to reflect change in societal thinking and reduces the economic imperative.

### 2.3 New Zealand Antarctic Tourism Policy

It was within this context that the New Zealand Government adopted the Policy Statement on Tourism and Other Non-Government Activities in Antarctica in May 2003. The Policy was reported to have been developed in response to increasing concern about the management of the environmental effects of tourism as well as safety and potential jurisdictional issues that may arise as a result of the expansion and diversification of these activities (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade).

There appears to be some confusion regarding the existence of a pre-2003 New Zealand policy on tourism in the Antarctic. Dr Alan Hemmings reports that such a document existed, and that he was instrumental in removing it from the public domain (personal correspondence). This position was supported in the literature by Robertson. Alice Revell, Policy Advisor to the Antarctic Policy Unit, reported that there has never been a separate New Zealand Antarctic tourism policy, and that New Zealand Antarctic tourism was covered by the 1995 Statement of Strategic Interest in Antarctica. Attempts to obtain a copy of the elusive policy were unsuccessful.

The 2003 policy on Antarctic tourism and non-governmental activities uses different “tone of vocabulary” to the strategy document. Phrases such as “limit tourism”, “effectively manage”, “control”, “avoid promotion”, “oppose expansion” and “limit support” suggests that New Zealand intends to control activity and adopt a restrictive approach. Similarities can be drawn between this approach and that taken by New Zealand when confronted with the evolving mining issue in the 1970 / 1980’s. Attempts to find literature on the development of this approach were unsuccessful, however, after the Christmas period some literature may be forthcoming from Wellington archives.

Consideration of New Zealand’s contribution to international Antarctic management forum sheds some understanding on the Government’s approach to the issue. New Zealand sought to have tourism as a key item on the agenda at the 2004 Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, indicating that New Zealand is concerned about the

issue. New Zealand's submission to the Meeting of Experts in March 2004 supports the findings of this review (MFAT, 2004).

### **3. Implications, Challenges, Future Issues**

#### **3.1 Dancing with Unforeseen Demons.**

The feasibility of individuals and non-governmental organisations accessing Antarctica independently by air or sea is increasing. Proposals for private land-based operations have already been developed and Antarctic tourism is increasing. TIANZ (Tourism Industry Association of New Zealand) suggests that a realistic estimate of Antarctic tourism in 2010 is 1.5 million per annum. Tourism and non-governmental presence in Antarctica is already established, and will expand. It may evolve in currently unforeseen ways, and global solutions need to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate this.

TIANZ has published a set of policy principles for a sustainable tourism industry based on the broad principle that the role of government is to shape and deliver policy and regulatory environments that enables profitable and sustainable growth.

In this environment, and with this view, it is easy to understand how frustration and concern on the part of New Zealand Antarctic Tourism operators could develop. Don McKinnon (cited Trotter, p20) suggests that a key change in New Zealand policy development in the last few years has been the transition towards greater public and stakeholder consultation and participation in policy-making. This case study suggests that the transition is on-going and challenging.

#### **3.2 Implications of Tourism – Understanding the Threat**

The mechanism of tourism potentially poses a risk to the credibility and stability of the Antarctic region. Instability in Antarctica presents a threat to New Zealand national security. Any risk to the Antarctic Treaty System, and the ramifications of

subsequent conflict, would be very real given the country's proximity to the continent (Wallace, cited Galvin, p 21).

Current Antarctic operations operate under the auspices of governmental organisations, with clear rules, authority and jurisdiction. Tourists and non-governmental operations operate outside this system. Likelihood of criminal activity and unlawful actions increases as the number of personnel operating outside the existing system increases.

In the late 1970's Beeby stated that the gap in the Treaty on the issue of jurisdiction had not given rise so far to major controversy, "largely because those on the Antarctic are for the most part scientific and supporting personnel effectively subject to the discipline of base and expedition leaders and military commanders". Beeby went on to observe, "there is no general public given to committing crimes requiring police and court action", but noted that "this situation could however change quite rapidly if tourism in Antarctica should expand beyond its present modest stage" (cited, paper submitted to Norway meeting, 2004).

The possibility of private buildings or structures on the continent is increasing. If this occurs it will create friction associated with property rights. Suter debates the challenges that the concept of property rights in Antarctica presents to the Antarctic Treaty System, but presents no simple solution (Suter, 1989, p 145).

Inequity of access and exploitation of tourism opportunities by some organisations within certain states could also result in an imbalance of perceived revenue by certain states. This could also contribute to instability in the system.

And in the case of tourism, as with mining and fishing, this is an arena in which business reality can conflict with governmental policy - and contesting government policy has the potential to create internal friction. Internal conflict within any individual member state could impact on a state's position on an issue. As the Antarctic Treaty System is a consensus based system, incompatibility and division

could result. This could result in instability in the treaty system, and it is within this context that there risk to the Antarctic Treaty System.

The implications of the threat to New Zealand, where our regional security is heavily influenced by treaty stability, are far reaching and potentially explosive. As unrestrained tourism expands, the issues and problems will compound. Literature exploring these risks and threats, and the implications for New Zealand was not identified. These issues do not appear to have been thoroughly addressed.

Hemmings neatly sums the challenge up when he states that “ ... the new commercial interest ... seems to seek to undermine the existing (and already rather limited) governance regime we have in place. ... The tensions which underlay claims – vis the inherent instability of a region of resource potential which has never been incorporated into the global property-rights regime” (Hemmings, cited Tetley, p87).

## **Summary and Conclusion**

As New Zealand moves forward, it is continually striving to become an internationally competitive economy and to improve it's standing on the world stage. But as a small island nation situated on the doorstep of Antarctica, a region whose stability is guaranteed only while is it operating under the management of the Antarctic Treaty System, New Zealand is also constantly balancing its economic needs against regional security.

In the area of Antarctic policy and strategy, regional security is perceived to be intricately related to the preservation of the Antarctic Treaty System, and for this reason, the minimisation of risks to the Antarctic Treaty System is of prime strategic importance. This theme is reiterated in all Antarctica policy related literature and policy statements.

Tourism is perceived to be a potential risk to the Antarctic Treaty System. Many analogies can be drawn between the risk and actions surrounding the potential risks with mining in Antarctica, and the potential risk associated with tourism. In both cases New Zealand has tried to have a proactive position, and in both cases, New Zealand has adopted a regulatory constrictive approach.

It is within this context that New Zealand's Antarctic tourism policy needs to be considered. Considering New Zealand's overriding concern to maintain the Antarctic Treaty System and regional stability, this potential risk to the system must be taken very seriously. Within this context, the restrictive approach taken by the New Zealand Antarctic Policy Unit can be understood.

Very little literature exists on the debates surrounding the development of the New Zealand Antarctic tourism policy, and indications from a key stakeholder is that he disagrees with the policy and that it will harm his business. Undoubtedly it has the potential to do that. But from available literature it appears that New Zealand policy makers have considered the needs of the state (regional stability) to be of more importance. There may be implications in this finding for New Zealand Antarctica policy makers in terms of stakeholder consultation and communication.

It is extremely interesting to note however, the disparity between New Zealand tourism policy versus Antarctic tourism policy. In a market driven society where increasing market share is encouraged, this is a clear example of national policy drivers in operation. This example neatly demonstrates why a global view and big-picture approach is crucial in Antarctic related policy and decisions. This example also neatly demonstrates why New Zealand businesses should not regulate or lead policy decisions.

The confusion surrounding the existence of a previous policy on the part of the Antarctic Policy Unit suggests that consideration of retention of institutional memory and intellectual property management may be of value. This loss of knowledge or inadequate knowledge could prove problematic for New Zealand policy makers in

future, as it is only with a balanced, open and informed consideration of issues that an effective way forward can often be found.

In conclusion, New Zealand is to be applauded for its anticipatory policy position. As the Antarctic Treaty System struggles to find a solution to the potential risks associated with tourism in Antarctica, New Zealand has independently considered the issue (behind closed doors) and placed a marker in the sand.

It is unfortunate that records of the considerations, discussions and debates surrounding this policy are not readily available in the public domain.

Further consideration of the potential risk to the Antarctic Treaty System posed by tourism is vital, and an alternative position may evolve (as in the minerals situation).

In the meantime, while the Antarctic community considers the issue, New Zealand has taken a bold stand and instituted a regulatory approach. The potential risk that Antarctic Tourism presents to the stability of the Antarctic Treaty System appears to be the key driver in the development of the 2003 Antarctic Tourism Policy.



## Bibliography

1. Antarctica New Zealand., Antarctic Tourism Workshop., Antarctica New Zealand., Christchurch, 2000.
2. Antarctica New Zealand., New Zealand's Future in Antarctica., Antarctica New Zealand., Christchurch, (date unknown).
3. Antarctic Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC)., Regulating Commercial Tourism in Antarctica : The Policy Issues., Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting XXVI Information Paper IP-067-ASOC, Madrid, 2003.
4. Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting., Final Report of the Twenty-Fourth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Saint Petersburg, 2001
5. Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting., Final Report of the Twenty-Fifth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Warsaw, 2002.
6. Beeby, C., ATCM XV : Paris Opening address
7. Buhrs., T., Bartlett, R., Environmental Policy in New Zealand. Oxford University Press, Auckland, 1993.
8. Clark and Williams., New Zealand's Future in the Global Environment – A Case Study of a Nation in Transition. New Zealand Employers Federation, 1995. GP Publications, Wellington.
9. Conte, A. (Ed)., New Zealand Yearbook of International Law 2004., International Law Group, Canterbury University, 2004.

10. External Intelligence Bureau., The Strategic Significance of Antarctica., The Government of New Zealand., Wellington, 1977.
11. Galvin, N., Policies on Ice – New Zealand's Antarctic Policy Choices., Wellington, 1987.
12. Goff, P., New Zealand Backs Stronger Management of Antarctic Tourism., Government Press Release, May 2003.
13. Hay, J.E., Hemmings, A.D., Thom, N.G., Antarctica 150 – Scientific Perspectives <-> Policy Futures., Proceedings of a conference organized by Environmental Science, University of Auckland, Auckland, 1990.
14. Hovi, J., Games, Threats and Treaties – Understanding Commitments in International Relations., Cassell, England, 1998.
15. International Association of Antarctic Tour Operators., Antarctic Tourism Briefing., International Association of Antarctic Tour Operators, 2004.
16. Jackson, A (Ed)., On the Antarctic Horizon., Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Future of the Antarctic Treaty System, Argentina, 1995.
17. Jezek, K.C., Tipton-Everett, L (eds)., Managing the Antarctic Environment : From Observations to Policy. A Workshop Report. BPRC Report No.12, Byrd Polar Research Centre, The Ohio State University, Ohio, 1995.
18. Mason, P., Legg, S.J., Antarctic Tourism : Activities, Impacts, Management Issues and a Proposed research Agenda., Pacific Tourism Review, Volume 2, Number 4, 1998.
19. Moore, M., A Brief History of the Future – Citizenship of the Millennium., Shoal Bay Press, Christchurch, 1998.

20. Mulgan, R., Politics in New Zealand (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed)., Auckland University Press, Auckland, 2004
21. New Zealand Government., White Paper on Antarctic Environment, (NZ 98532J.89PT) V.R Ward. Government Printer, Wellington, 1989.
22. New Zealand Institute of International Affairs., The Antarctic. Preferred Futures, Constraints and Choices., June 1983.
23. New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade., An Analysis of the Existing Legal Framework for the Management of Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica : Issues, Some Proposals and Comments., New Zealand Briefing Paper to the New Zealand Delegation to the Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on Tourism and Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica, Tromso, Norway, 2004.
24. New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade., New Zealand and Antarctica, Information Bulletin, Number 59 – April 1996, Wellington, 1996.
25. New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade., New Zealand and the XX<sup>1</sup>st Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting., Information Bulletin, Number 61 – December 1997, Wellington, New Zealand.
26. New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade., Draft New Zealand Policy and Procedures for Visitors to Antarctica, (including comments by Hemmings, A.), Wellington, 2003
27. New Zealand Ministry of Tourism., New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010, New Zealand Government.
28. Prior., S., Antarctica : View from a Gateway. Working paper 5/97., Victoria University Press, Wellington, 1997.

29. Shaw, M.N., International Law (5thEd)., University Press, Cambridge., 2003.
30. Suter, K., Antarctica – Private Property or Public Heritage ?., Pluto Press London, 1991.
31. Tetley, G., (Ed)., Antarctica 2010 – A notebook. Proceedings of the Antarctic Futures Workshop., Christchurch, 1998.
32. The Antarctic Treaty, 1959.
33. Trotter, A., Fifty Years of New Zealand Policy Making., University of Otago Press, Dunedin, 1995.
34. Waterhouse, E.J (ed)., Ross Sea Region – A State of the Environment Report for the Ross Sea Region of Antarctica., New Zealand Antarctic Institute, Christchurch, 2001.
35. Wouters, M., Antarctic Tourism – Where To ? Tourism and New Zealand's Future Role : A Case Study., Graduate Certificate in Antarctic Studies Literature Review, Gateway Antarctica, University of Canterbury (date unknown).
36. Yeabsley, J (Ed)., Global Player ? Benchmarking New Zealand's Competitive Upgrade., New Zealand Institute of Economic Research, Wellington, 2001.

## Websites

- 37. Greens Party Position on New Zealand Tourism Policy
- 38. Heritage Expeditions Limited
- 39. International Association of Antarctic Tourism Operators (IAATO)  
[www.iaato.org](http://www.iaato.org)
- 40. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) [www.mfat.govt.nz](http://www.mfat.govt.nz)
- 41. Ministry of Tourism (MoT) [www.tourism.govt.nz](http://www.tourism.govt.nz)
- 42. Tourism Industry Association of New Zealand (TIANZ) [www.tianz.org.nz](http://www.tianz.org.nz)
- 43. Government Press Releases [www.Beehive.govt.nz](http://www.Beehive.govt.nz)

## Personal Communication

- 44. Mark Miller, Research Advisor, Ministry of Tourism
- 45. Alice Revell, Senior Policy Advisor, Antarctic Policy Unit, Ministry Foreign Affairs and Trade
- 46. Trevor Hughes, Head, Antarctic Policy Unit, Ministry Foreign Affairs and Trade
- 47. Alan Hemmings, Environmental Consultant - Polar Regions

## **Appendix 1**

### **New Zealand Statement of Strategic Interest in Antarctica – Revised 2002**

New Zealand is committed to conservation of the intrinsic and wilderness values of Antarctica and the Southern Oceans, for the benefit of the world community and for present and future generations of New Zealanders. This will be reflected in active and responsible stewardship, under the Antarctic Treaty System, that promotes New Zealand's interests in:

- i. National and international peace and security through a commitment to keeping Antarctica peaceful, nuclear free, and its environment protected;
- ii. Continued influence in Antarctica governance through maintaining an effective role in the Antarctic Treaty System, and maintaining its long term interest, commitment to and credible presence in the Ross Dependency;
- iii. Conserving, protecting and understanding the biodiversity of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, in particular the biodiversity of the Ross Sea region, including the promotion, protection, and management of representative special areas, and enhancing biosecurity;
- iv. Conservation and sustainable management of the marine living resources of the Southern Ocean, and in particular the Ross Sea, in accordance with CCAMLR and the Antarctica Environmental Protocol, and within this context supporting strong environmental standards and sustainable economic benefits;
- v. Supporting and where appropriate leading, high quality Antarctic and Southern Ocean science that benefits from the unique research opportunities provided by Antarctica;
- vi. Demonstrating and advocating for best practice in environmental stewardship and all other activities throughout Antarctica, and in particular the Ross Sea region;

- vii. Ensuring all activity is undertaken in a manner consistent with Antarctica's status as a natural reserve devoted to peace and science.

## **Appendix 2**

### **New Zealand Policy Statement on Tourism and Other Non-Governmental Activities in Antarctica**

Consistent with Antarctica's status as a natural reserve devoted to peace and science, and the obligation to minimise the environmental impacts of all activities, New Zealand will work within the Antarctic Treaty System to limit tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica, and to ensure that where they do occur they are conducted in a safe and environmentally responsible manner by:

1. Seeking the strengthening, and where appropriate the addition, of the means to manage effectively, and where necessary control, tourism and other non-governmental activities in Antarctica. A particular aim should be to ensure all such activities are assessed before commencement for the highest possible prevention of incident standards and have in place credible and effective response mechanisms should an incident occur;
2. Avoiding the promotion of any further expansion of Antarctic tourism, and supporting limits on visitation of sites where cumulative impacts are likely to lead to deterioration;
3. Opposing any expansion of permanent or semi-permanent land-based tourism in Antarctica, especially in the Ross Dependency;
4. Continuing to limit the extent of the government support to tourist and other non-governmental expeditions to Antarctica to humanitarian assistance and basic hospitality (such as short visits to Scott base).